



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,057	04/27/2001	Kathleen Riddell Polizzi	68110328.715	1459
23562	7590	06/16/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 2300 DALLAS, TX 75201			TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/845,057	Applicant(s) POLIZZI ET AL.	
	Examiner Kenneth Tang	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 17, 18, 20-26 and 28-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-4, 17-18, 20-26, and 28-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 10/17/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive.
2. Claims 1, 3-4, 17-18, 20-26, and 28-43 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-4, 18, 20-21, 23-24, 36-38, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daswani et al. (hereinafter Daswani) (US 2002/0023108 A1) in view of Rangan et al. (hereinafter Rangan) (US 6,802,042 B2).**

4. As to claim 1, Daswani teaches a computer portal system electrically connected to a plurality of computer systems and configured to communicate with a plurality of users through a network interface, wherein at least one of the plurality of users communicates with the network interface through a computer network, the computer portal system comprising:

a service broker (subscription server, etc.) electrically connected to the network interface (Fig. 2), the service broker controlling a level of access to the computer portal system by a user (security provisions from a firewall, etc.) ([0014], [0053], [0039], [0044], *Abstract*);

Art Unit: 2195

a job repository electrically connected to the service broker, the job repository comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects including at least one job, the at least one job having at least one set of job properties, wherein said set of job properties includes a set of input data ([0014], [0053], [0039], [0044], *Abstract*);

a job server electrically connected to the service broker, the job server configured to execute said at least one job and to produce an output report of the job, wherein the job server is configured to process the set of input data ([0014], [0053], [0039], [0044], *Abstract*); and

a job event server electrically connected to the service broker, the job event server comprising a computer memory encoded with instructions for dispatching a job for processing on a corresponding job server according to a predefined schedule ([0014], [0053], [0039], [0044], *Abstract*).

Daswani fails to explicitly teach producing an output report and processing according to a predefined schedule. However, Rangan teaches an internet-connected enterprise portal system with multiple servers and a repository with jobs such as retrieving data from a database, preparing report based on retrieved data, processing data according to a predefined schedule and notifying subscribed users (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, col. 6, lines 4-15, etc.*). Rangan's portal system allows the user to alter the program that controls the disposition of tasks and jobs (*col. 6, lines 28-31, col. 9, lines 1-8, etc.*). It is noted that the standard definition of a job is a task performed by a computer system, wherein the jobs can be performed by a single program or a collection of programs. The Applicant's Specification does not contradict that. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2195

combine Rangan with Daswani because this would provide a convenient and effective enhancement to a data summarization service for a user analysis (*col. 3, lines 20-27*).

5. As to claim 3, Daswani ([0058]) and Rangan (*col. 11, lines 48-57, col. 15, line 30, col. 18, lines 35-38*) teach wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define a list of users to be notified when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to process said job properties and provide notification to the list of users when the job is executed.

6. As to claim 4, Daswani (*Abstract*) and Rangan (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, etc.*) teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job subscribing users for notification. Daswani and Rangan is silent on having interrupts/exceptions. However, it is well known and obvious for interrupts or exception conditions to be used in Daswani and Rangan's processing system because it would provide control of timing for when notification occur, etc.

7. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1.

8. As to claims 20-21, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 3-4.

Art Unit: 2195

9. As to claim 23, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 1 and 4.

10. As to claim 24, Daswani teaches wherein the job properties further define an input form to be provided to a corresponding job server when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to provide a corresponding input form to said at least one user ([0054]).

11. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Rangan teaches receiving, retrieving, dispatching and processing job requests, wherein jobs are retrieving data from a database, preparing report based on retrieved data, processing data according to a predefined schedule and notifying subscribed users (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, etc.*). Daswani also teaches these limitation in ([0013], [0016], and [0019], *etc.*).

12. As to claims 37-38, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 3-4.

13. As to claim 40, Daswani ([0042], *etc.*) and Rangan (*see Abstract, col. 4, lines 10-28*) teach wherein the job server is connected to at least one back-end database, the method further comprising: retrieving a set of data corresponding to the requested job from a back-end database; and processing the requested job in the job server with the set of data retrieved from the back-end database and the corresponding set of input data so as to produce an output report.

Art Unit: 2195

14. As to claims 41-42, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 3-4.

15. **Claims 17, 22, 25-26, 28-35, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daswani et al. (hereinafter Daswani) (US 2002/0023108 A1) in view of Rangan et al. (hereinafter Rangan) (US 6,802,042 B2), and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 2003/0058277 A1).**

16. As to claim 17, Daswani and Rangan fail to explicitly teach using an SQR job. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page over an internet network communication ([2045]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page to the existing network communication system because it is a robust report generator and it also provides a higher-level programming language ([2045]).

17. As to claims 22 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

18. As to claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 (see mappings to references Daswani and Rangan). In addition, Daswani teaches authentication

Art Unit: 2195

security that is handled in one of the plurality of servers (*Fig. 1*). However, Daswani and Rangan are silent on having the page be dynamic. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using dynamic, real-time web pages in addition to various servers such as an Authentication Server ([1421], [1478], [0256], *etc.*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bowman-Amuah to Daswani and Rangan because it would increase the ability to accommodate any changes in data ([0843]).

19. As to claim 28, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claim 3.

20. As to claim 29, Rangan teaches wherein the notification is provided through e-mail (*col. 17, lines 1-6, etc.*).

21. As to claim 30, Bowman-Amuah teaches wherein the notification is provided by updating a dynamically updated portal object in a user's portal page ([0256], *etc.*).

22. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.

23. As to claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 29.

24. As to claim 33, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 26 and 30.

Art Unit: 2195

25. As to claims 34-35, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

26. As to claim 39, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 17.

27. As to claim 43, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 17.

Response to Arguments

28. During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

29. *Applicant argues that neither Daswani and Rangar fail to teach or suggest an enterprise arrangement.*

In response, Ranger literally teaches that the portal system is enterprise based (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, col. 6, lines 4-15, etc.*).

Art Unit: 2195

30. *Applicant argues that the definition of the term "job" is an executable program and its associated files.*

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., job to be an executable program and its associated files) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regardless, the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the Specification of the claimed job is satisfied.

31. *Applicant argues that Daswni nor Rangar disclose the disposition of jobs within an enterprise-wide computer portal system.*

Rangan's portal system allows the user to alter the program that controls the disposition of tasks and jobs (*col. 6, lines 28-31, col. 9, lines 1-8, etc.*). It is noted that the standard definition of a job is a task performed by a computer system, wherein the jobs can be performed by a single program or a collection of programs. The Applicant's Specification does not contradict that. Ranger literally teaches that the portal system is enterprise based (*col. 6, lines 33-35, col. 7, lines 25-30, Abstract, col. 6, lines 4-15, etc.*).

32. *Applicant argues that there Daswani nor Rangan teaches a job repository.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It was already shown above that the broadest reasonable interpretation of jobs has been met and taught. Besides what has already

Art Unit: 2195

been shown in Rangan and Daswani, it is inherent and common sense that something has to store the jobs or tasks that were shown to exist.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2195

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kt
6/9/06


MENG-AL L. L. L.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100